

Hon. Richard Jones

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

KYLE LYDELL CANTY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF SEATTLE, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. 2:16-CV-01655-RAJ-JPD

CITY OF SEATTLE DEFENDANTS'
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
REGARDING COMPUTING AND
EXTENDING TIME
PURSUANT TO LCR 6 (a)

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Defendants City of Seattle and Officers Marshall Coolidge, Sean Culbertson, Timothy Renihan, and Hancock (hereinafter "City of Seattle Defendants") request that Plaintiff's motion pursuant to LCR 6 (a) regarding the computation or extension of time be denied.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Plaintiff Pro Se has brought this civil rights action against the City of Seattle Defendants, as against King County and several of its employees. Plaintiff has filed a motion seeking "always a sixty day deadline date not including according to King County the ten business days that it takes for Mr. Canty . . . to physically receive the U.S.P.S. mail in his hands . . ." Plaintiff's Motion, pp. 1-2. Plaintiff's motion does not identify any specific action or court-imposed deadline for which he is seeking an extension of time.

CITY OF SEATTLE DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE
TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION REGARDING
COMPUTING AND EXTENDING TIME
PURSUANT TO LCR 6 (a)

NO. 2:16-CV-01655-RAJ-JPD

III. STATEMENT OF ISSUES

Should Plaintiff's motion for an extension of sixty days be denied where he has failed to identify a specific deadline for which he seeks an extension or otherwise show good cause for the extension of all case related deadlines?

IV. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON

The City of Seattle Defendants rely on the pleadings and the court's file herein.

V. ARGUMENT

Plaintiff generally asks for "a sixty day deadline," but he does not reference what action or deadline he is requesting an extension for. Without any evidence, Plaintiff claims that the King County Jail, where he is incarcerated, "has been intercepting all mail, opening it, and then giving it directly to the King County Prosecutor's Office and the Seattle Police Department." Plaintiff's motion, p.3. Even if this were true, Plaintiff fails to explain how this justifies the broad extension of all court deadlines that he appears to be requesting. Requests for extensions or relief from court-imposed deadlines should be made only as needed, and each request should be supported by good cause. The court should therefore deny Plaintiff's broad request for a sixty-day extension as to all deadlines in this case.

///

///

///

CITY OF SEATTLE DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE
TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION REGARDING
COMPUTING AND EXTENDING TIME
PURSUANT TO LCR 6 (a)
NO. 2:16-CV-01655-RAJ-JPD

1
2 **VI. CONCLUSION**

3 For all the forgoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion for an extension of all court deadlines
4 should be denied.

5
6 DATED this 13th day of July, 2017.

7
8
9 s/ John R. Nicholson

10 JOHN R. NICHOLSON WSBA #30499

11 Freimund Jackson & Tardif, PLLC

12 701 5th Avenue, Suite 3545

13 Seattle, WA 98104

14 Telephone: (206) 582-6001

15 Facsimile: (206) 466-6085

16 Johnn@fjtlaw.com

17 Attorneys for Defendants City of Seattle,
18 Officer Marshall Coolidge, Sean Culbertson,
19 Timothy Renihan and Officer Hancock
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 CITY OF SEATTLE DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE
TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION REGARDING
COMPUTING AND EXTENDING TIME
PURSUANT TO LCR 6 (a)
NO. 2:16-CV-01655-RAJ-JPD

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 13th day of July, 2017, I caused a true and correct copy of this document to be served on the following in the manner indicated below:

Pro se Plaintiff, Kyle Lydell Canty #216035994 King County Jail (Seattle) 500 5 th Ave. Seattle, WA 98104	(X) U.S. Mail
---	-----------------

DATED this 13th day of July, 2017, in Seattle, Washington.

s/Kathie Fudge
KATHIE FUDGE, Legal Assistant to
GREGORY E. JACKSON
701 5TH Avenue, Suite 3545
Seattle, WA 98104
kathief@fjtlaw.com

CITY OF SEATTLE DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE
TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION REGARDING
COMPUTING AND EXTENDING TIME
PURSUANT TO LCR 6 (a)
NO. 2:16-CV-01655-RAJ-JPD